

cloture is not invoked at that time, the Senate will resume the highway bill.

We hope to complete the bill tomorrow evening. We will have rollcall votes throughout the day. I do not know of any conflicts tomorrow evening. Tonight, there are a number of conflicts, including the President and Mrs. Clinton have invited all Members to the White House for a picnic plus other things. I know that Senators have obligations to attend.

If cloture is not invoked Wednesday, a second vote on cloture will occur at 2 p.m. on Thursday.

If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask the Senate stand in recess under the previous order following the remarks of Senator FORD and Senator SANTORUM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LINE-ITEM VETO

Mr. FORD. As the majority leader indicated as it relates to the line-item veto, I voted for the line-item veto when it left here because I think it is important that we put that into the structure.

When I spoke earlier, just before passage of the line-item veto legislation, I tried to tell my colleagues that the proposal that left here, in my opinion, was too cumbersome; that if we had the Interior appropriations bill that we had last session, there would be 2,040 pieces of legislation under that one bill. Then the President would have to sign 2,040 pieces of legislation in order to either sign them or veto them or line item it, however it might be. So it really is not a line-item veto; it becomes a multiple choice.

It reminds me when I was Governor that we would have a commission authorized, the Governor, to go to New York to sign bonds for highway projects, or whatever it might be. They give you one pen and there would be 49 other pens up there and you sign your name down here and the other 49 pens would work and all those bonds would move aside and then you sign them again.

That is basically what we are trying to do, I think, or cause the President to have to do once these pieces of legislation come up for line-item veto.

When I was Governor I had three options. I had line-item veto. The three options: one, I could line item it and send a message to the legislature why I had vetoed or line itemed that particular piece of legislation or that item in that legislation. The legislature could consider it. They could either sustain the Governor's veto or override it.

The second option I had was to reduce an amount. If we did not need to spend all of it—we had a 2-year budget, we did not need to spend all that money in the first year. We could reduce it, and you draw a line through it, initial it, send a message to the legislature, and they could either sustain or override the veto.

The third option I had was to line item a phrase. That may be a direction—"You cannot use any money for so and so," or "If you are going to use money, you have to do it this way." The Governor had the right to eliminate a phrase.

Those are the only three things. It was simple, direct, and the legislature had an opportunity to sustain or override the veto.

What I am asking tonight, as the conferees were appointed for the line-item veto legislation in conference, is that they look very seriously at what the Senate has done in sending their piece of legislation to conference.

I think simpler is better. It is easy, it is direct. A message must come. And that message, then, can either be accepted or declined. Either sustain the veto or override the veto. I think that is what we ought to do.

Mr. President, I voted in support of the line-item veto when it left here in the hopes that it would be reduced and made somewhat simple so we could line-item veto, we could partially veto—or a phrase; it does not have to be all.

A line-item veto, when you try to explain it to your constituents back home, they think that gives the President the right to take some pork out of the budget.

Right now he has to sign 2,040 pieces of legislation for one appropriations bill. Just one. We are getting into thousands and thousands of pieces of legislation. I think that is wrong.

I hope the conferees will take into consideration my remarks tonight. I would be glad to work with them in any way. And several in this Chamber have had experience as Governors using the line-item veto. In my 4 years as Governor, it was seldom even considered.

It can be done and I think it can be done in the right sort of way. I thank the Chair for its courtesy. I yield the floor.

WHERE IS THE BUDGET?

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. President. First, I would like to thank the Chair for his indulgence in spending the time that I am supposed to be in the chair presiding and doing that for me. As customary, the Senator from Virginia is always there to do the gentlemanly thing and fill in a need. I appreciate very, very much the indulgence of the Senator.

I am back to continue my vigil in requesting the President put forward a balanced budget resolution. The last time I appeared here on the Senate floor was the night the President announced his balanced budget resolution. I had sketchy details at the time but did not have the full package that the President presented.

We have gotten it. It is about 6 or 7 pages, double-sided, about that big, that thick. That is his budget proposal, compared to his first budget proposal which was about this thick, to give the comparison, the amount of detail.

As Members have heard on the Senate floor today and in newspapers and other places, it just does not measure up. The President uses a whole lot of assumptions that are exaggerated and made to make the projections of the economic growth and interest rates and everything else look rosy, and as a result, gets to a balanced budget through his numbers with smoke and mirrors.

The Congressional Budget Office, who, in a State of the Union Address in 1993, he stated would be the numbers that he would use—that everyone should use because they are the most accurate—that he would use in determining whether we get to a balanced budget, scores the Clinton budget as continuing deficits of \$200 billion or more. It is a straight line. Deficits do not come down at all under this budget proposal as scored by the Congressional Budget Office.

The people who scored his budget over 10 years as getting the deficit to zero were the Office of Management and Budget, which is over in the Department of Treasury, which is his own people scoring his own numbers, which are, as was said, rosy assumptions. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the one that the President says we have to use, says that we have \$200 billion deficits into the future for the next 10 years.

So, as a result, I have to come back and add another number to this chart, which says, "Days with no proposal to balance the budget from President Clinton."

I gave a period of time to give him the benefit of the doubt to get the numbers up here to let us see what the specifics were, whether this would be scored by a neutral party, the Congressional Budget Office, as a balanced budget resolution. In fact it has come back to be not balanced. It is disappointing.

I just want to go over a couple of the details of the budget and then I want to address, finally, this chart which has gotten a little publicity here, of late.

First, the details of the budget. The Republican budget gets to balance by the year 2002. What are the deficits that are estimated by the Congressional Budget Office under the Clinton budget: \$196 billion in 1996, \$221 billion in 1997, \$199 billion in 1998, \$213 billion in 1999, \$220 billion again in the year 2000; \$211 billion in 2001, \$210 billion in 2002, \$207 billion in 2003, \$209 billion in 2004, and \$209 billion again in the year 2005; over \$2 trillion in additional debt over the next 10 years under his revised budget which he says gets us to zero, which the Congressional Budget Office says gets us to even worse shape than we are now, \$209 billion as opposed to \$175 billion projected this year. So we have made no progress even under Clinton II.

Let us look at the specifics of Clinton II. If you compare the Clinton second budget to his first budget, the one he

submitted to the Congress in February that nobody in this Chamber voted for—99 “no” votes, 1 “absent”—under the Clinton first budget in discretionary spending, that is nonentitlement spending, he cuts over 5 years, \$2 billion from his first budget. This new revised budget that is going to be tough, that is going to get us to zero, that is going to do all these things—make the tough decisions, face up to the music for the American public, that he went on national television to tell us how important it was, now to come to the table and make these tough choices—\$2 billion over 5 years.

Under his first budget he was to spend, just to give an idea of the magnitude of the numbers we are talking about, over the first 5 years in his first budget he submitted in February that did not come to balance—it did not even pretend to come to balance—total discretionary spending over that 5-year period, \$2.730 trillion. That is the total discretionary spending accounted for in the Clinton first budget.

The Clinton second budget—new, improved, I am going to get you to balance, make the tough decisions, tighten the belt some more, we have gotten the message from the American public, I know you want me to deliver—not \$2.730 but \$2.728 trillion. So over 5 years he reduced discretionary spending by \$2 billion. That is not a Weight Watchers approach to the budget. You are not going to loosen any notches on \$2 billion out of \$2.7 trillion.

So how does he do it, if he does not cut discretionary? He admits he does not cut discretionary. You cannot play around with those numbers. How does he do it? He looks at these cuts in the outyears. He does not do much in the first few years. He sort of back-end loads it.

In fact, of the 10-year budget that he has proposed, you would think if we are going to cut money over 10 years you would do it on a straight line. You cut so much per year every year to get to balance. It does not take much of a mathematician, which I am not, to figure out if you were going to cut the same amount every year to get your balance, sort of a straight line down, you would have to get about 10 percent a year. That is what you would figure.

In the first year the President cuts 2 percent; 2 percent of his cuts first year, 3 percent next, 4 percent next, 5 percent next, in years 9 and 10, 17—almost 18 percent of the cuts and almost 21 percent of the cuts; the last 2 years, long after—that is three Presidents from now—he decides that is when we are going to do all the cutting.

It is a lot easier if you are sitting in the White House and look two or three Presidents down the road and have them do all the tough work. He does not do any of the tough work under the rest of his administration or the poten-

tial next administration. So again, all the tough decisions are put off to future Congresses and future Presidents and none of the real tough decisions are made now.

I say that in criticism of the President's budget. But I will say that I appreciate that he at least came to the table. He did not come to the table with much. He is not going to feed a lot of people with what he has at the table, but he at least came. He entered into the debate, he made some, I think, relevant comments when he came to some of the health care programs and how they had to be on the table. I know it upset folks on the other side of the aisle but at least he came and said we have an obligation to do this.

I hope he comes back with some real budgets and with some real numbers that show that we will do this. So I unfortunately will have to come back and talk more about how the President has not come through with a budget.

There are a couple of things I want to comment on in wrapping up, and again I appreciate the indulgence of the Senator from Virginia.

There was an article in the Washington Post on Sunday about how some of my colleagues were upset with this chart I have on the floor because of its irreverence, some may suggest, in its title. I was criticized by Members that I should not, in a chart, refer to the President by his first name.

I did a little looking back, as to how the other side treated Republican Presidents when they were in the majority—when they were here and the President was a Republican. I found just a few things. We did not do an extensive research—frankly, you did not have to do extensive research to quickly find references to Presidents which were in my opinion a heck of a lot more pejorative in nature than mentioning the President's first name in a chart.

In the 99th Congress, the next-to-the-last Congress, when President Reagan served as President, there were 77 references by Members to the term “Reaganomics.” That at the time was not a flattering term. “Reaganomics,” 77 times. In the 100th Congress 42 times. The term “Reaganomics” appeared in the journal here in the U.S. Senate, used by Members of the U.S. Senate to describe Ronald Reagan's fiscal policies. That is not a very nice thing to say. Yet I do not recall any of those comments being made and Members being attacked for that.

I have, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD here, March 3, 1989, the Senator from South Carolina, the junior Senator from South Carolina referring to President Reagan as “Ronnie,” in his discussion. I do not assume to use any more familiar terms in referring to the current President.

I have, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of 1991, the Senator from Massachusetts who used the term, not only on November 15, but on November 7 and November 1, the phrase “waiting for George,” George Bush, the President of the United States. “Waiting for George is more frustrating than waiting for Godot.” He used that phrase several times during debate in 1991 with respect to the unemployment compensation extension.

So, I mean, I also will refer back to the Senator from Massachusetts, September 20, 1988, during the campaign where he referred to the then-Vice President, candidate for President, as “Where was George then?” That was, as I mentioned before, the reason for this chart. The term “Where's George” was a popular saying back in 1988. And it was a popular saying, not as the Senator from North Dakota said to me while on debate the other day, at the Convention, the Democratic National Convention in 1988, but also on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

So, I think before we get a little high and mighty about the reverence paid to people, I do say “Days with no proposal to balance the budget from President Clinton.” We try to be respectful and I am respectful of the office of the President and of President Clinton, but I think this chart is well within the bounds of decorum here in the U.S. Senate, and I do so with the greatest amount of respect and also with a very sincere effort to try to bring the President's attention back to this issue, to where he can become a relevant player in making budget policy for this country, which I think the country needs.

Whether we like it or not, the President has to sign the budget reconciliation. So he needs to be relevant to this process. We need the President. We cannot do it alone. We would like to be able to do it alone but we cannot. That is not the way the Constitution set it up. He needs to be relevant and needs to be involved. And I appreciate the first step he took, and his advisers who encouraged him to come to the fore and make that suggestion.

Now it is time to come and do a little harder work and get that—sharpen that pencil a little bit and start working with real numbers to come up with real solutions to the problems that face this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate now stands in recess until 9 a.m. tomorrow, June 21, 1995.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:29 p.m., recessed until Wednesday, June 21, 1995, at 9 a.m.